

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are currently pending. With this Response, Applicants have amended Claims 5, 9, and 10. The amendments to the claims are expressed in the detailed listing above.

**Objections to Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings. According to the Examiner, “The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the transistors connected as recited by claims 9 and 10 (see claim objections below) must be shown or the features canceled from the claims.”

Applicants have amended claims 9 and 10 to overcome the Examiner’s objections to these claims. With these amendments, every feature specified in the claims is shown in the drawings. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the drawings. Furthermore, no corrected drawings are necessary.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 5, 6, 9, and 10 stand objected to because of various informalities.

Applicants have amended claims 5, 9, and 10 to more clearly define aspects of the invention. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 5, 6, 9, and 10.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Koike (USPN 6,519,165). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants' claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "using a feedback voltage that is *inversely* proportional to an output voltage,...." (emphasis added). Such limitation is not disclosed or taught in Koike.

Koike teaches the use of a feedback voltage that is *directly* proportional to the output voltage. In particular, Koike states, "The voltage feedback circuit 36 produces a voltage feedback signal  $V_f$  in proportion with the converter output voltage  $V_o$ ." Koike, col. 5, lns. 51-53. And Koike further states, "The voltage feedback circuit 36 includes a phototransistor 38 optically coupled to the LED 25, FIG. 1, of the output voltage detector circuit 5. The resistance offered by the phototransistor 38 changes in inverse proportion to the intensity of the optical output from the LED 25. The phototransistor 38 has its emitter grounded via a resistor 39, and its collector connected to a power supply 40, so that the feedback voltage  $V_f$  across the resistor 39 is proportional to the converter output voltage  $V_o$ ." Koike, col. 5, lns. 57-65. As such, Koike teaches away from Applicants' claim 1 which recites "using a feedback voltage that is *inversely* proportional to an output voltage,...." Thus, Koike does not anticipate Applicants' claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn and this claim be allowed. Furthermore, because claim 7 depends from claim 1 and include further limitations, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of this dependent claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) also be withdrawn and that claim 7 be allowed.

#### **Allowable Claims**

Claims 8 and 11-14 are allowed.

The Examiner objected to claims 2-4 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 (which should be in condition for allowance as discussed above) and include further limitations. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 2-4 and allow these claims.

The Examiner indicated that claims 5 and 6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action and to include the limitations of the base claim. Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 (which should be in condition for allowance as discussed above) and include further limitations. Furthermore, claim 5 has been amended to overcome the other objections as discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow claims 5 and 6.

The Examiner indicated that claims 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action. Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to overcome the other objections as discussed above. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow claims 9 and 10.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance and request that the case be passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7428.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

12/12/05


Date

Richard A. Park

Signature

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Philip W. Woo  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 39,880  
PWW/rp

December 12, 2005

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
555 California Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715